

**REMARKS**

The foregoing amendment does not include the introduction of new matter into the present application for invention. Therefore, the Applicants, respectfully, request that the above amendment be entered in and that the claims to the present application be, kindly, reconsidered.

The Office Action dated July 7, 2003 has been received and considered by the Applicants. Claims 1 through 10 are pending in the present application for invention. Claims 1 through 10 are rejected by the Office Action dated July 7, 2003. Claim 9 is objected to by the Office Action due to informalities that have been corrected by the foregoing amendment to the claims. The foregoing amendment to the claims has added new claims 11-16.

Claims 1-6 and 8-9 are rejected by the Office Action dated July 7, 2003 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,469,191 issued in the name of Smith, III et al. (Smith et al.). Essentially, the Office Action states that Smith et al. teaches all the recited elements of the rejected claims 1-6 and 8-9.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner states that Smith et al. discloses a cursor movement system providing both straight and smooth curve movement in a video application. The Applicants would like to, respectfully, point out that claim 1, before the amendment, recites inputting a second directional command to cause the parameter to vary at a different speed either in the first or in the opposite direction. The Examiner states that Smith et al. teaches continuing the pressing of the start button to cause the speed to increase in the same direction. The Applicants, respectfully, point out that the Examiner's comments have left out the term "opposite direction" Accordingly, this rejection contained within the Office Action does not reach all the recited elements of the invention. The rejection contained within the Office Action omits the term an opposite direction. In the Applicants would like to, respectfully, point out that in order to sustain a rejection of anticipation under 35 USC § 102, each and every element must be found within the cited reference. Accordingly, this rejection under 35 USC § 102 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended and effort to move this case towards allowance. The amended version of claim 1 identifies a second value for the second direction, which is less than the first

value for the first direction. The Applicants believe that this amendment to claim 1 clearly distinguishes the recited elements of the invention from the recited prior art references.

Regarding claim 2, the Examiner states that Smith et al. discloses a speedometer-like display for representing the currently selected speed of the arrow tool. The Applicants would like to, respectfully, point out that the up foregoing amendment to the claims results in amended version of claim 2 in which the second direction is the same as the first direction, however, the second value is less than the first value. Therefore, the increase in speed in the first direction in accordance with the recitation contained in amended claim 2 is less than the first value. This feature is not disclose, or suggested, by Smith et al.

Regarding claims 3-4, the Examiner states that FIG. 5 of Smith et al. demonstrates that the arrow tool will proceed in the opposite direction in response to operator actions taken at the direction control pad. The Applicants would like to, respectfully, point out that the up foregoing amendment to the claims results in amended version of claim 3 in which the second direction is opposite the first direction, and, the second value is less than the first value. Therefore, the speed in the first direction is inherently decreased according to the recitation contained in amended claim 3. This feature is not disclose, or suggested, by Smith et al.

Regarding claims 5-6, the Examiner states that FIGS. 6 and 7 of Smith et al. illustrate a full operational relationship between the controller and the arrow tool. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that claim 5 in its original form recites a stop command causing the parameter of to retain its current value. The Examiner has not indicated the actual parameter within Smith et al. Claim 5 to the present invention states that the stop command causes the parameter to retain its current value. The Examiner that indicated a value for a parameter that retain its current value within cited prior art reference Smith et al. Accordingly, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claims 8-9, the Examiner states that Smith et al. discloses a manual input device and refers back to the rejection to claim 1. The Applicants would like point out that claim 1 has been amended and currently recites a second directional command having a second value that is less than the first value for the first directional command. The Nintendo controller discussed by Smith et al. does not teach nor disclose a second directional command is recited by

the amended claims.

Claims 7 and 10 are rejected by the Office Action under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being obvious over Smith et al. in view of by U.S. Patent No. 6,025,831 issued in the name of Gardner (Gardner). Specifically, the Office Action states that Smith et al. fails to disclose that the input means and the command are voice recognition devices. The Examiner states that Gardner teaches a method and apparatus for controlling the input device including a voice command device on a column 5, lines 39-44. This combination does not teach, or suggest, a first directional voice command or a second directional voice command. Additionally, the amended claims recites that the second directional voice command has a value that is smaller than the first directional voice command. This is not shown or suggested in the combination made by the Office Action. Moreover, in the Examiner has failed to show why a person still the art would be motivated to add voice command to a Nintendo controller as discussed by Smith et al.

New claims 11-17 have been added by the foregoing amendment. These newly added claims depend from claims 9 and 10, which has previously discussed are believed to be allowable, therefore claims 9 and 10 are also believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, with such allowance being, respectfully, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James D. Leimbach, Reg. 34,374

Patent Attorney (585) 381-9983

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria VA. 22313-1450

on: November 7, 2003

(Mailing Date)

(Signature)